

17035 W.Valley Hwy, Tukwila, WA 98188 • P.O. Box 3562, Seattle, WA 98124 Phone: (425)251-9800 • Fax: (425)251-5886

August 28, 2008

City of Tukwila Mr. Jack Pace Director of Community Development Department of Community Development 6300 Southcenter Parkway Boulevard, Suite #100 Tukwila, WA 98188

Re.: Shoreline Master Program (SMP)

Testimony before Tukwila Planning Commission on August 28, 2008

Dear Mr. Pace:

Harnish Group Inc. and its subsidiaries, N C Machinery Co. and N C Power Systems Co., have two parcels of land that will be affected by this proposed Shoreline Master Program:

- The first parcel includes approximately 21 acres on West Valley Highway, with addresses running from 16711 to 17035. This is a bell shaped parcel, surrounded on three sides by the Green River.
- The second parcel is located at the corner of 180th and West Valley Highway, immediately across the highway from the Green River.

Although we are still in the process of reviewing this lengthy and complex proposal, we have identified many issues that we find troublesome and that we ask you to consider before recommending approval.

Lack of Public Participation

On page 7 of the plan it is stated that the development of any SMP requires "citizen involvement in development of policies and regulations". The plan then states that, "as part of this renewed SMP update process, the City has continued the previously started citizen involvement program". We believe that that the public has not been involved as required and that the public is largely unaware of the signed feet of this properal. 8/28/08

Page 2 of 3 August 28, 2008 Mr. Jack Pace

- Although the plan notes that a Shoreline Advisory Panel (which included a
 representative from our Company) was appointed in 1999, that panel has not met
 since 2000. Also, the previous panel's recommendation was to make no changes
 more intrusive than the then current requirements of the State or the county
 which is much different than what is being proposed today.
 This is a totally new SMP with new recommendations, and the work of that
 earlier board should not be deemed as an endorsement of this draft document.
- Although the initial Planning Commission hearing for this plan was held on August 7th, the first notices to land owners were not mailed until August 8th. With this hearing being held on the 28th, there has not been adequate time for citizen input.
- The City needs true public input, including mailings, workshops, etc.

The City is not required to adopt a new SMP until 12/1/09, and time should be allowed for true citizen input.

Excessive buffers

Our property is located in the Urban Conservancy Environment, which requires a 125' buffer. This represents a huge illegal uncompensated taking of private property, and would severely limit the use and value of our land.

- The plan gives no reason as to why 125' is needed, although it does discuss the desire for flood management. There is no dike on our (East) side of the river, and there has been no erosion problem in our area. Thus, we see no need for this increased buffer.
- If the purpose of the buffer is to allow for public access to the river and for improved habitat, private property owners should not be the uncompensated source of these public uses.
- Our land is designated for high urban uses. One of the primary goals of the Growth Management Act was to allow intensified use within these designations so that urban sprawl does not occur. The taking of huge chunks of land within urban and industrial zones will require that more land be designated for these uses in suburban and rural areas.

Existing uses and future development

- If approved as now drafted, many of our current buildings would become legal non-conforming uses. This designation reduces their value due to the requirement to meet new regulations if major improvements are needed.
- Future development will require us, as private property owners, to provide or pay for public access to the river.
- Our 21 acre parcel, with water on three sides, would be disproportionately affected when compared to other parcels (see attached site map).

Page 3 of 3 August 28, 2008 Mr. Jack Pace

We ask that the City put a hold on adoption of the current SMP to enable the review and input of the public, including those whose property is being affected.

Sincerely,

John F. Storm

Facilities Project Manager

Enclosure Site Maps

IMAP (C) 2008 King County 3

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.



IMAP The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential darriages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County. King County

Source: King County iMAP - Property Information (http://www.metrokc.gov/GIS/iMAP)

Dale: 8/28/2008

